



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/982,954	10/22/2001	Gurtej Sandhu	M4065.0353/P353-A	8784
24998	7590	01/10/2005	EXAMINER	
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN & OSHINSKY LLP 2101 L Street, NW Washington, DC 20037			MOORE, KARLA A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1763	

DATE MAILED: 01/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Applicati n N .

09/982,954

Applicant(s)

SANDHU ET AL.

Examiner

Karla Moore

Art Unit

1763

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 October 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,6-13,16,17 and 46-48 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,6-13,16,17 and 46-48 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 October 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 6-8, 10-13 and 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,319,553 to McInerney et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,935,334 to Fong et al.

3. McInerney et al. disclose the invention substantially as claimed, including: a multi chamber deposition apparatus (Figure 10) for processes such as atomic layer doping, where simultaneous processing of wafers in separate regions is desired (column 3, row 9). The apparatus comprises a plurality of regions (column 3, row 29; Figure 10, 112, 114, 116, and 118) and a centrally located loading assembly (Figure 3, 104; column 4, row 21). The plurality of regions can be separated into two pairs of regions, so that, in each pair of regions a first region (112 or 116) is capable of applying a first gas species and a second region (114 or 118) is capable of a second processing step (column 5, row 14). All regions are adjacent and chemically isolated from one another by an inert gas curtain of argon (Figure 1, 210; column 8, row 37). The loading assembly moves the substrates from region to region through said inert gas curtain (column 11, rows 54-57).

4. Similar to the claimed invention, the loading assembly is capable of moving a plurality of substrates through all four regions sequentially or in a predefined pattern (column 5, row 5). Thus, a plurality of substrates can be treated simultaneously in respective pairs of first and second regions and then transferred to another plurality of regions.

5. However, McInerney et al. fail to teach a first atomic layer region used for deposition and a second atomic layer region used for thermal diffusion of the dopant species.

Art Unit: 1763

6. Fong et al. teach deposition of a dopant species in a first processing region and transfer to a second processing region, such as an annealing chamber or a rapid thermal process reactor, for the purpose of driving in the dopant atoms (column 41, row 61 through column 42, 12).

7. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the Applicant's invention was made to have provided a first atomic layer doping region for deposition and a second atomic layer doping region for thermal treatment in McInerney et al. in order to diffuse the dopant atoms as taught by Fong et al.

8. McInerney et al. and Fong et al. disclose the invention substantially as claimed and as described above. In addition to what is described above both McInerney et al. and Fong et al. teach heating of the substrate. For instance, Fong et al. disclose the use of a heating assembly housed within a wafer pedestal for the purpose of transferring heat to the wafer during processing. Examiner realizes that the heating assembly in Fong et al. is actually located in the susceptor/pedestal, rather than under the pedestal. However, the courts have ruled that the mere rearrangement of parts which does not modify the operation of a device is prima facie obvious. In re Japikse, 181 F.2d 1019, 86 USPQ 70 (CCPA 1950). In re Kuhle, 526 F.2d 553, 188 USPQ 7 (CCPA 1975).

9. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McInerney et al., Fong et al. as applied to claims 1, 6-8, 10-14 and 16-17 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,207,005 B1 to Henley et al.

10. McInerney et al., Fong et al. and Matijasevic et al. disclose the invention substantially as claimed and as described above. Additionally, McInerney et al. teach that there is no limitation as to the specific number of chambers that can be used (column 3, row 26).

11. However, McInerney et al., Fong et al. and Matijasevic et al. fail to teach an apparatus comprising a third pair of atomic layer doping regions.

12. Henley et al. disclose a deposition apparatus comprising 3 pairs of deposition regions (Figure 1).

Art Unit: 1763

13. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the Applicant's invention was made to have provided an additional pair of deposition regions in McInerney et al., Fong et al. and Matijasevic et al. in order to increase the throughput of the deposition apparatus as taught by Henley et al.

14. Claim 46 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,319,553 to McInerney et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,935,334 to Fong et al. and European Patent Application No. 0 060626 to Gattuso et al.

15. McInerney et al. disclose the invention substantially as claimed, including: a multi chamber deposition apparatus (Figure 10) for processes such as atomic layer doping, where simultaneous processing of wafers in separate regions is desired (column 3, row 9). The apparatus comprises a plurality of regions (column 3, row 29; Figure 10, 112, 114, 116, and 118) and a centrally located loading assembly (Figure 3, 104; column 4, row 21) for moving substrates from one region to another. The plurality of regions can be separated into two pairs of regions, so that, in each pair of regions a first region (112 or 116) is capable of applying a first gas species and a second region (114 or 118) is capable of a second processing step (column 5, row 14). All regions are adjacent and chemically isolated from one another by an inert gas curtain of argon (Figure 1, 210; column 8, row 37). The loading assembly moves the substrates from region to region through said inert gas curtain (column 11, rows 54-57).

16. Similar to the claimed invention, the loading assembly is capable of moving a plurality of substrates through all four regions sequentially or in a predefined pattern (column 5, row 5). Thus, a plurality of substrates can be treated simultaneously in respective pairs of first and second regions and then transferred to another plurality of regions.

17. However, McInerney et al. fail to teach a first atomic layer region used for deposition and a second atomic layer region used for thermal diffusion of the dopant species.

Art Unit: 1763

18. Fong et al. teach deposition of a dopant species in a first processing region and transfer to a second processing region, such as an annealing chamber or a rapid thermal process reactor, for the purpose of driving in the dopant atoms (column 41, row 61 through column 42, 12).

19. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the Applicant's invention was made to have provided a first atomic layer doping region for deposition and a second atomic layer doping region for thermal treatment in McInerney et al. in order to diffuse the dopant atoms as taught by Fong et al.

20. McInerney et al. and Fong et al. disclose the invention substantially as claimed and as described above.

21. However, McInerney et al. and Fong et al. fail to teach an inert gas curtain provided at a higher pressure than an atmosphere containing said first dopant species.

22. Gattuso et al. teach the use of an inert gas curtain provided at a pressure somewhat higher than that of the reaction gases within the chamber to create an effective, non-reactive gas curtain (abstract).

23. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the Applicant's invention was made to have provided an inert gas curtain at a higher pressure than the reaction gases in McInerney and Fong et al. in order to create an effective and non-reactive gas curtain as taught by Gattuso et al.

24. Claim 47 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,319,553 to McInerney et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,935,334 to Fong et al., European Patent Application No. 0 060626 to Gattuso et al. and U.S. Patent No. 5,382,126 to Hartig et al.

25. McInerney et al. disclose the invention substantially as claimed, including: a multi chamber deposition apparatus (Figure 10) for processes such as atomic layer doping, where simultaneous processing of wafers in separate regions is desired (column 3, row 9). The apparatus comprises a plurality of regions (column 3, row 29; Figure 10, 112, 114, 116, and 118) and a centrally located loading assembly (Figure 3, 104; column 4, row 21) for moving substrates from one region to another. The

Art Unit: 1763

plurality of regions can be separated into two pairs of regions, so that, in each pair of regions a first region (112 or 116) is capable of applying a first gas species and a second region (114 or 118) is capable of a second processing step (column 5, row 14). All regions are adjacent and chemically isolated from one another by an inert gas curtain of argon (Figure 1, 210; column 8, row 37). The loading assembly moves the substrates from region to region through said inert gas curtain (column 11, rows 54-57).

26. Similar to the claimed invention, the loading assembly is capable of moving a plurality of substrates through all four regions sequentially or in a predefined pattern (column 5, row 5). Thus, a plurality of substrates can be treated simultaneously in respective pairs of first and second regions and then transferred to another plurality of regions.

27. However, McInerney et al. fail to teach a first atomic layer region used for deposition and a second atomic layer region used for thermal diffusion of the dopant species.

28. Fong et al. teach deposition of a dopant species in a first processing region and transfer to a second processing region, such as an annealing chamber or a rapid thermal process reactor, for the purpose of driving in the dopant atoms (column 41, row 61 through column 42, 12).

29. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the Applicant's invention was made to have provided a first atomic layer doping region for deposition and a second atomic layer doping region for thermal treatment in McInerney et al. in order to diffuse the dopant atoms as taught by Fong et al.

30. Additionally, McInerney discloses that each of the gases can be connected to any number of gas supplies so that several different gases can independently controlled to flow through each showerhead (column 5, rows 14-20). This is interpreted as: any of the gas supplying showerheads (specifically those in the second region) is capable of being connected to a non-reactive gas supply source. When combined with Fong et al., as detailed above, one is left with first and second doping regions capable of depositing a doping species in a first region and allowing that species to diffuse with the assistance of a non-reactive gas in a second region.

31. Examiner realizes that the prior art fails to explicitly teach the use of a non-reactive gas in a second region. However, this is seen as an intended use of which the prior art would be capable. The

Art Unit: 1763

courts have ruled that expressions relating the apparatus to the contents thereof during an intended operation are of no significance in determining the patentability of the apparatus claim. *Ex parte Thibault*, 164 USPQ 666, 667 (Bd. App. 1969).

32. McInerney et al. and Fong et al. disclose the invention substantially as claimed and as described above.

33. However, McInerney et al. and Fong et al. fail to teach an inert gas curtain provided at a higher pressure than an atmosphere containing said first dopant species.

34. Gattuso et al. teach the use of an inert gas curtain provided at a pressure somewhat higher than that of the reaction gases within the chamber to create an effective, non-reactive gas curtain (abstract).

35. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the Applicant's invention was made to have provided an inert gas curtain at a higher pressure than the reaction gases in McInerney and Fong et al. in order to create an effective and non-reactive gas curtain as taught by Gattuso et al.

36. McInerney et al., Fong et al. and Gattuso et al. disclose the invention substantially as claimed and as described above.

37. However, McInerney et al., Fong et al. and Gattuso et al. fail to teach a separate gas exhaust for each region in a multi-chamber coating apparatus.

38. Hartig et al. teach the use of separate gas exhausts in each chamber for the purpose of aspirating gas from each chamber and further preventing gas transfer between the individual chambers (column 2, rows 17-22).

39. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the Applicant's invention was made to have provided separate exhaust mechanisms in each chamber in McInerney et al., Fong et al. and Gattuso et al. in order to aspirate each chamber and further prevent gas transfer between the individual chambers as taught by Hartig et al.



Art Unit: 1763

40. Claim 48 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,319,553 to McInerney et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,935,334 to Fong et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,527,866 to Matijasevic et al. and U.S. Patent No. 3,618,919 to Beck.

41. McInerney et al. disclose the invention substantially as claimed, including: a multi chamber deposition apparatus (Figure 10) for processes such as atomic layer doping, where simultaneous processing of wafers in separate regions is desired (column 3, row 9). The apparatus comprises a plurality of regions (column 3, row 29; Figure 10, 112, 114, 116, and 118) and a centrally located loading assembly (Figure 3, 104; column 4, row 21) for moving substrates from one region to another. The plurality of regions can be separated into two pairs of regions, so that, in each pair of regions a first region (112 or 116) is capable of applying a first gas species and a second region (114 or 118) is capable of a second processing step (column 5, row 14). All regions are adjacent and chemically isolated from one another by an inert gas curtain of argon (Figure 1, 210; column 8, row 37).

42. Similar to the claimed invention, the loading assembly is capable of moving a plurality of substrates through all four regions sequentially or in a predefined pattern (column 5, row 5). Thus, a plurality of substrates can be treated simultaneously in respective pairs of first and second regions and then transferred to another plurality of regions.

43. However, McInerney et al. fail to teach a first atomic layer region used for deposition and a second atomic layer region used for thermal diffusion of the dopant species.

44. Fong et al. teach deposition of a dopant species in a first processing region and transfer to a second processing region, such as an annealing chamber or a rapid thermal process reactor, for the purpose of driving in the dopant atoms (column 41, row 61 through column 42, 12).

45. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the Applicant's invention was made to have provided a first atomic layer doping region for deposition and a second atomic layer doping region for thermal treatment in McInerney et al. in order to diffuse the dopant atoms as taught by Fong et al.

Art Unit: 1763

46. McInerney et al. and Fong et al. disclose the invention substantially as claimed and as described above. Additionally, both McInerney et al. and Fong et al. teach heating of the substrate. Fong et al. disclose the use of a heating assembly housed within a wafer pedestal for the purpose of transferring heat to the wafer during processing. Examiner realizes that the heating assembly in Fong et al. is actually located in the susceptor/pedestal, rather than under the pedestal. However, the courts have ruled that the mere rearrangement of parts which does not modify the operation of a device is prima facie obvious. In re Japikse, 181 F.2d 1019, 86 USPQ 70 (CCPA 1950). In re Kuhle, 526 F.2d 553, 188 USPQ 7 (CCPA 1975).

47. However, McInerney et al. and Fong et al. fail to teach the use of individual heaters for each processing region.

48. Matijasevic et al. teach the use of individual heaters (Figure 1, 106; column 5, rows 28-31 and column 9, rows 39-43) in each reaction zone of a multi-zone processing apparatus for the purpose of tailoring the temperature to the desirable reaction or reaction rate in a particular reaction zone.

49. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the Applicant's invention was made to have provided individual heaters for each region in McInerney et al. and Fong et al. in order to tailor the temperature to the desirable reaction or reaction rate in a particular reaction zone/region as taught by Matijasevic et al.

50. McInerney et al., Fong et al. and Matijasevic et al. disclose the invention substantially as claimed and as described above.

51. However, McInerney et al., Fong et al. and Matijasevic et al. fail to teach a physical barrier present between adjacent deposition regions.

52. Beck teaches the use of a physical barrier for a gaseous atmosphere (Figure 1, 10) having a closeable opening (56; see Figures 3 and 4 for open and closed positions, respectively) for the purpose of efficiently and controllably isolating respective gas atmospheres of adjacent processing regions (column 1, rows 37-42).

Art Unit: 1763

53. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the Applicant's invention was made to have provided a physical barrier with a closeable opening in McInerney et al., Fong et al. and Matijasevic et al. in order to efficiently and controllably isolate respective gas atmospheres of adjacent processing regions as taught by Beck.

### ***Response to Arguments***

54. Applicant's arguments filed 21 October 2004, with respect to the rejections made in the previous office action have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. With respect to claims 1, 6-13, 16-17 and 46-47, Applicant's argument disputing the fact that the loading assembly moves "through said inert gas curtain" is not accurate. As noted above the loading assembly does move "through said inert gas curtain". See column 11, rows 54 through 57. With respect to claim 48, Applicant's argument disputing the fact that the loading assembly moves "through said inert gas curtain" has been considered but is moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Beck fairly teaches the newly added recitation.

55. With respect to all pending claims, Examiner notes that whether or not McInerney teaches the loading assembly as "lifting" the wafer is immaterial because McInerney also clearly teaches that the loading assembly as "rotating", so that the wafers are clearly moved through the inert gas curtain, as claimed.

56. Applicant's arguments, with respect to the combination of McInerney and Gattuso et al, regarding the use of an inert gas curtain provided at a higher pressure than the first and second gas species, have been considered but are not persuasive. As noted in the previous office action, Gattuso et al. provides motivation/support for the combination.

57. With respect to Applicant's arguments regarding the combination of the teachings of McInerney and Hartig et al. as is related to separate/single gas port(s), Examiner points out (as was also pointed out in the previous office action) **motivation for the combination is found in Hartig et al.** Examiner did not (and does not) suggest that no motivation is needed for the combination of the references, rather that it is not necessary for both of the references to provide motivation for the combination. Examiner notes that the courts have ruled that "the test of obviousness is not whether features of the secondary reference

Art Unit: 1763

may be bodily incorporated into the primary reference's structure, nor whether the claimed invention is expressly suggested in any one or all of the references, rather the test is what the combined teachings would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art." Ex parte Martin 215 USPQ 543, 544 (PO BdPatApp 1981). **Further, Examiner also notes that McInerney et al. does in fact suggest that separate exhaust ports/mechanisms can be provided for each processing region at column 4, row 67 through column 5, row 2.** There is no need to glean these teachings from Applicant's disclosure, for these teachings are well described in the prior art.

58. Applicant's general arguments with respect to the modification of McInerney to have a physical barrier having a closeable opening have been considered but are not persuasive. The arguments are treated in general as they would apply to the newly cited reference. As noted in the previous office action, the presence of multiple structures in an apparatus for accomplishing prevention of the same problem (for instance, maintaining a separation of adjacent processing regions) is not nullifying. "Complementary structures" for performing a common task are a well-known concept. In many cases the presence of "complementary structures" (for instance, a physical barrier and a chemical barrier) leads to enhanced results. Further, as noted above, the courts have ruled that "the test of obviousness is not whether features of the secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the primary reference's structure, nor whether the claimed invention is expressly suggested in any one or all of the references, rather the test is what the combined teachings would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art." Ex parte Martin 215 USPQ 543, 544 (PO BdPatApp 1981).

### **Conclusion**

59. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH**

Art Unit: 1763

shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Karla Moore whose telephone number is 571.272.1440. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:30am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Mills can be reached on 571.272.1439. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



km  
30 December 2004



Parviz Hassanzadeh  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1763